

(3) It was not exactly a mistake in any of the offices as was suspected while furnishing additional information with reference to the supplementary questions from the Member at the Vrischigam meeting. The three officers having been appointed on the maximum of the grade on special grounds and thereby having preferential claims for purposes of promotion to the next higher grade, it was considered desirable to put their names at the top as a guide in regulating future promotions. Under ordinary circumstances and subject to good work promotions are generally given in the order of the names in the *Civil List*, but special cases are considered on their merits. There has thus been no impropriety in revising the order in the *Civil List*.

(4) (a) Yes. The reply given was that his protest will be placed on record so that he may not be estopped from putting forward his claims for promotion, when vacancies arise.

(b) Mr. Narayana Ayyar was promoted to the grade of Rs. 200—250 on his appointment as Professor.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—May I know whether it is laid down that higher pay is the basis of seniority for promotion?

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—It is accepted as one of the principles.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—In the same grade?

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—Yes. In the same grade there are several scales of pay, and so it so happens that all officers may be in the same grade but drawing different pay.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Is not seniority determined by the date of confirmation according to the *C. S. R.*?

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—But it may so happen that an officer who was confirmed in the grade later may be drawing a scale of higher pay in the same grade. There are five scales of pay in one grade.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—There are special grounds referred to in answer to sub-division (3).

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—The fact of the matter was that, when these three officers were appointed, they were new recruits and they were appointed on the maximum pay of the grade. That was Rs. 200. Whereas the senior men were on Rs. 150 and different scales of pay up to Rs. 200. The fact that they were appointed straightaway on Rs. 200 gave them ground of seniority.

Taungya System.

123. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(1) the total extent of the area planted till date with teak

under the Taungya system with the locality and extent in each place;

(2) the conditions under which the above areas are planted with the names of the different contractors in each area;

(3) the exact quantity of fuel and timber removed from each area by different contractors and the value thereof at the existing seigniorage rates;

(4) how was the planting work done in Karikottali, whether under Taungya system, departmentally or other agency, the total area of the plantation;

(a) if under the Taungya system, the quantity of stuff removed from the area and the value thereof at the seigniorage rates;

(b) if departmentally, or any other agency, the value realised for the quantity of growth removed from the area and who was the contractor who purchased the forest growth; whether the forest growth was auctioned or given to a private individual;

(c) if the work is done departmentally the actual cost of planting;

(d) if by other agency, to whom the contract was entrusted, whether by inviting tenders or after auction and what is the amount paid to the contractor;

(5) if the work at Karikottali was entrusted to a private contractor after payment for the work done, why could not the work in other places also be conducted after disposing of the timber and realising the value thereof to the credit of the Government;

(6) the total cost that would have been incurred by Government if the areas given for planting works under the Taungya system are given on contract like the area at Karikottali according to the sanctioned rate for this area;

(7) what could be the total cost including all works for planting and maintenance of the plantations worked under the Taungya system till they are handed back to the Government at the rate given for Karikottali for planting and subsequent maintenance;

(8) what could be the approximate amount of revenue that could have been realised if the growth at the areas worked under the Taungya system were sold in public auction as is done in the case of forest growth from the excluded areas for food crop cultivation; calculating the average rate realised from the latter per acre during the recent auction sales at Kallur, Puthur and other villages;

(9) the total area sold in Kallur and Puthur villages from exclusions and the value realised in auction and the average rate per acre;

(10) the amount of loss the Government has incurred by entrusting the work on Taungya system calculated according to the rate for the forest growth referred to in sub-division (9) above and according to the rate given for planting and subsequent maintenance referred to in sub-divisions (6) and (7) above;

(11) will the Government be pleased to place on the Table the Huzur Office file and the Conservator of Forest's file regarding the proposal for entrusting plantation works under the Taungya system?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—(1) Taungya plantations—
The total extent of the area planted till date is 607·31 acres.

<i>Locality.</i>	<i>Extent.</i>
	<i>Acres.</i>
1 Chettikkulam ..	268·70
2 Echippara ..	85·22
3 Malayattur ..	37·39
4 Velupadam ..	55·00
5 Pulikanny ..	63·00
6 Kuttenchira ..	40·00
7 Pattikkad ..	58·00

(2) The selected areas were entrusted to contractors who were allowed to remove the forest growth therefrom free and to return the areas at the end of 15 months fully stocked with teak at the rate of not less than 680 plants per acre. They were also required to raise two crops on the areas selected.

Mohamed Khan, S. Mohamed Abdul Kadir, C. L. Mathew, Kochery Thomas, Kallali Lonappan, P. V. Joseph, Manjali Chakkappan, Swedesy Tile Works, Sivakami Tile Works and Parlikkadan Antony.

(3) Information is being collected.

(4) The work was executed on contract under the departmental supervision; the total area of the plantation is 53·58 acres.

(a) The work was not done under the Taungya system.

(b) Rs. 2,945—14—10; the growth was sold to the planting contractor E. V. Ouseph at the seigniorage rates.

(c) No answer is necessary in view of the answer to (4) above.

(d) Mr. E. V. Ouseph; no tenders were invited nor was there any auction; amount paid is Rs. 1,600.

5) The procedure would have involved additional expenditure over and above the value realised for the forest growth.

(6) Rs. 18,135—6—10.

(7) Rs. 29,674—5—1.

(8) The value for the growth at the average rates realised at the exclusion auction sales in Puthur, Kallur and other villages would come to Rs. 10,627—14—9.

(9) 1. 851.58 acres in Kallur and 573.41 acres in Puthur villages were sold.

2. Rs. 24,205—7—1 was realised in auction in both the villages.

3. The average rate per acre is Rs. 17—8—0.

(10) The Government has not incurred any loss; on the other hand there has been positive gain.

(11) The files referred to cannot be placed on the Council Table.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—(4) (c). The answer is 'no answer is necessary in view of the answer to (4) above'. May I know what was the expenditure under the terms of the contract referred to in (4)? The work was executed on contract under departmental supervision. What was the expenditure under the terms of the contract?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—The amount is given there, Rs. 2,945—14—10.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—That is for (b), the value realised for the quantity of growth removed from the area. The work was executed on contract under departmental supervision. May I know under the terms of the contract referred to there what was the expenditure involved?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—Question (4). How was the planting work done in Karikottali,...

President.—What was the expenditure incurred by the Government in executing this work, that is the question asked.

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—(4) The answer is the work was executed on contract and the amount spent for that is Rs. 2,945—14—10.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—That is the value realised for the quantity of the growth removed from the area.

President.—The work was executed under departmental supervision. With reference to that answer the work was executed on contract under departmental supervision. What was the amount incurred in connection with the execution of work?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—Rs. 1,600, given in (d).

President.—The amount paid is Rs. 1,600. Is that the

expenditure incurred, the amount paid to the contractor for the work under departmental supervision?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—Yes.

Transport of timber without passes.

124. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state what is the explanation of the subordinates who allowed the transport of Mugaseth's timber without passes referred to in the answer to question No. 202 (d) of the Budget Session of 1904?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—On account of exigencies of the transport, the logs were allowed to be transported on proper invoices as per the orders of the Conservator of Forests.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—May I know whether it is not a violation of the rule to allow transport of timber without passes?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—Yes, it is a violation? It was done on account of the exigencies of the transport as per orders.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—What were the exigencies?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—There was deficiency of stock of timber for transport to the Tramway.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—The timber was sold to Mr. Mugaseth at Chalakkudi. He transported that.

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—There was deficiency of stock for the work of the Tramway.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—The transport was from Chalakkudi to Ernakulam of Mugaseth's timber without passes. What is the deficiency?

President.—No question of Tramway transport arises. This is from Chalakkudi to Ernakulam. No passes are necessary for transport from Chalakkudi to Ernakulam. Passes are for transport from the Hills to Chalakkudi. So there is no violation of any rule.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—May I know what was the exact explanation given by the subordinates?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—That is the explanation.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Which? Will you kindly read that explanation?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—I have not got the file here.

Public servants removed on account of chronic indebtedness.

125. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to lay on the Table:—

(a) a list of Government servants who were removed from